UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

The Psychology of Sex

By Elmo A. Robinson

Motion Pictures—Miracle or Menace?
- - - - - - - - - - - *Jessie H. Baird*

An Adventure in Cooperative Living
- - - - - - - - - - *Robert K. Williams*

Anti-Jewism - - - - - - *Ralph Westlake*

The Third Degree - - - - *Ethelred Brown*

VOLUME CXIV NUMBER 2

Chicago, September 17, 1934

PRICE TEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Bi-Weekly *Subscription $3.00*

Until Further Notice *Single Copies 10 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter November 15, 1933, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

ROBERT C. SCHALLER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY
JAMES H. WEST

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 23

ARTICLES—
War and Peace—*Spinoza* 23
The Psychology of Sex—ELMO A. ROBINSON 26
Motion Pictures—Miracle or Menace?—JESSIE H. BAIRD 29
An Adventure in Cooperative Living—ROBERT K. WILLIAMS 30
Anti-Jewism—RALPH WESTLAKE 33
The Third Degree—ETHELRED BROWN 34

POETRY—
The Murdered—LAURENCE LEE HOWE 25
The Murderer—LAURENCE LEE HOWE 25
Hidden Beloved—ETHEL COLLINS 33

THE STUDY TABLE—
A Testimony of Prayer—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 35
A Statesman Writes on Religion—JAMES A. FARLEY 35
American Milton—LYLE H. CORS 36
Napoleon on Horseback—ROBERT C. SCHALLER 37
A Notable Pamphlet—EDWARD OHRENSTEIN 37

CORRESPONDENCE—
A Correction—EDWARD SANDERS 38
Socialists of the World, Unite!—F. S. KINDER 38
A Reply to Dr. Whitaker—C. WOODBURY 39
Praise for UNITY—L. E. BLOCHMAN 39
An Appreciation—ROSE BASSETT ASCHERMANN 39

THE FIELD—
The New Barbarism—The Hostage System—ELLEN HORUP 22
When Governments Promote "Peace"—*World Events* 40

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

The New Barbarism—the Hostage System

[*From Our Special Correspondent*]

We live in strange times, full of inconsistency and self-contradiction, with mighty progress and a similarly mighty reaction athwart all the advances.

We hear each others voices all over the world. We reach each other through the air in days where before it took weeks, in hours where it previously took days. And then each country imprisons itself behind its frontiers and a wall of steel seems to enclose a hostile nationalism!

We live in a world where in one place we know what is happening in all other places, where all people have come nearer each other and where the possibility of understanding would seem to be greater than ever before. And then fog covers the eyes of statesmen! They fly around amongst the capitals of the great powers, and negotiate, and return home again, as befogged as ever.

Technology has given the world all the means for the exchange of thoughts, peoples, and goods; thus the world's surplus could stand all in good stead. And then the statesmen prepare for one thing only: destruction! Technology has opened all doors to a hitherto unknown international co-operation, and the statesmen can find nothing else for which to use its marvels but for war material. Into all the widely outstretched hands that demand a share in this world's goods, the statesmen lay bombs. On the lifted arms they hang rifles and gas masks. The whole world beyond the frontiers of their country they designate enemies, and in suffocating nationalism the hope of the age is lost.

People's disposition becomes morbidly ecstatic, they confuse hell with heaven. The menace of gas warfare takes their breath away. Confused they imagine that the fatality of war is the only thing that can rid them of the nightmare. So their thoughts become brutalized and they return to barbarity.

This expresses itself in many different ways. In religious persecution, in collective punishment, in the

(*Continued on page 89*)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXIV MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1934 Number 2

WAR AND PEACE

Of a commonwealth, whose subjects are but hindered by terror from taking arms, it should rather be said, that it is free from war, than that it has peace. For peace is not mere absence of war, but is a virtue that springs from force of character; for obedience is the constant will to execute what, by the general decree of the commonwealth, ought to be done. Besides, that commonwealth, whose peace depends on the sluggishness of its subjects, that are led about like sheep to learn but slavery, may more properly be called a desert than a commonwealth.

When, then, we call that dominion best, where men pass their lives in unity, I understand a human life, defined not by mere circulation of the blood, and other qualities common to all animals, but above all by reason, the true excellence and life of the mind.

But be it remarked that, by the dominion which I have said is established for this end, I intend that which has been established by a free multitude, not that which is acquired over a multitude by right of war. For a free multitude is guided more by hope than fear; a conquered one, more by fear than hope: inasmuch as the former aims at making use of life, the latter but at escaping death.

—*Spinoza.*

Everybody agrees that there are signs of recovery —that there has been a sure, if slow, upturn in business affairs. There has been an ominous slackening of progress this year which marks a real falling off from last year's swift and sensational advance, but none the less we are getting ahead. The bottom of the depression was obviously touched in the late months of 1932 and the early months of 1933. But, on the other hand, this recovery is woefully sluggish and uncertain. The advance made during the last year and a half is so small as compared with the vast measure of collapse and recession, that one wonders how many years it is going to take to get back, or as to whether we are ever destined to get back at all. And how long can we sustain ourselves in this pitifully slow progress toward normalcy? There's the real question that challenges us —the ability of the government, of society, to hold on, while the system pulls itself together and gets back upon its feet! It's like the question that so often faces the physician as he battles with some dread disease—will the heart hold out until the disease is conquered? The burden of relief, now on the government's shoulders, is back-breaking. Twenty per cent of our total population, we are told, is now in one way or another dependent on the government for support. This coming winter will be the worst yet—more people on the relief rolls than ever before! Unemployment has been cut down, but some 10,000,000 workers are still idle, with no prospect in sight, even under the best conditions, of reducing this total by more than another million or two. The tide of governmental expenditure still swells to an ever vaster flood, with crushing taxes and an end to such outpourings of money definitely in sight. It's like a sinking ship rushing to port. Can the vessel make it before she goes down? That's the question! And unless business picks up faster than it has done, or yet shows any signs of doing, the answer to this question is not doubtful.

President Roosevelt declares that the vast sums of money being poured out upon the nation these days are not being used for political purposes. We believe him so far as his own spirit and wishes are concerned. But, from the practical point of view, we are moved to doubt by three obvious facts. First, there is the Mephistophelean countenance of "Jim" Farley leering out of the post-office windows of the land. We know, by following his movements, that this man is not doing his appointed work as Postmaster General, but is active in other and very different matters. Secondly, there are the gushing streams of money lavished upon those places where elections are critical or important. The State of Maine at the moment we write is a case in point. The Democrats are determined to carry this State, in the early election which will take place before these words are printed, for the sake of the moral effect upon the country at large, and federal money can be had for almost any local project in almost any amount. Thirdly, there are the Democratic candidates who are themselves making no bones of boasting their success in getting money to distribute to loyal constituencies. The State of Maine, for example, is at this moment plastered with a poster put out in the interest of the Democratic candidate for U. S. Senator, running against the Republican incumbent, which reads:

> Vote For A Change
> Elect F. Harold Du Boro For U. S. Senator
> A Democratic Senator Can Do More For You

All this we regard as a scandal and a shame. The present administration has at its disposal unprecedented funds placed in its hands by votes of Democratic and Republican Congressmen alike. These funds, regardless of the desire or will of the President, are being wantonly used, in numerous instances to ends calculated to corrupt an electorate and buy an election. If any political debauchery could be worse, we do not happen to know what it is. Whether the nation has manhood enough left to punish this betrayal, we cannot say. But

the facts should be duly recorded, that history at least may not be deceived.

Repeated changes in the plan and policy of the NRA show an administration faithful to its announced purpose of experimentation. More and more it becomes evident that Roosevelt and his advisers are regarding the code system as permanent and will ask Congress to continue it indefinitely after its present date of expiration in 1935. This makes necessary some determination on the part of all of us, as citizens of the nation, as to whether the NRA is boon or bane to the country's welfare. For ourself, we are frank to confess—as our editorial utterances have all too definitely manifested, we fear!—that we are confused in the whole issue. From the beginning we have not known what to think nor to say about the NRA, and thus have backed and filled, blown hot and cold, in a way to confuse our readers as much as we are confused ourself. Only one thing has been clear to us, and that is that we would not join the mob and cheer everything the President did just because he was the President. We would continue to do our own thinking, if you please! But what to think? On the one hand, there is so much that is admirable in the NRA, especially in spirit if not in effect! What has genuinely moved us is the spectacle of government engaged in the task of lifting the industrial standards of the nation to a higher plane of justice and beneficence than it has ever occupied before. On the other hand, there is the undeniable fact of the surrender of industry to the autocratic control of big business, as witnessed by the suspension of the anti-trust laws, the inordinate rise of profits in relation to wages, and the revolt of labor against the nullification of code paragraph 7a. Basic is the fact, recently emphasized by Secretary Roper, that the NRA is working wholly inside the profit economy, and thus in essence bringing us no reform at all. What if we do get out of this depression? A system based on profits made out of high prices is certain to dump us into another depression sooner or later. We are paying a terrific toll for recovery, as we shall discover when the tax bill comes in. Why not really get somewhere while we are about it?

Upton Sinclair has confounded us all! In a campaign of almost unprecedented courage and vision, he has captured the Democratic nomination for governor in California by a staggering majority vote, and is entered upon a campaign which is certain to hold the attention of the entire country from now until election day. We were utterly skeptical of Mr. Sinclair's plans when they were originally announced. We knew him to be one of the three or four American authors who are destined to be remembered and admired a century hence. We have long regarded him as the greatest pamphleteer of our day, working worthily in the great tradition of Voltaire and Thomas Paine. We think his booklet, "I, Governor of California," is as effective a piece of writing as he has ever done, and are not surprised to hear that it has sold over 200,000 copies. But his E. P. I. C. plan seemed to us to have little chance of successful competition against the bewildering alphabetical array in Washington, and we did not see how one of the most famous and brilliant Socialists in the world could hope to attract California Democrats to his banners. *But he has done it*—and the country has lost its breath! We frankly rejoice in this astounding victory, and hope that it may be repeated in November. In the first place, it hurls utter confusion into the political field, and that always tickles us to death. To see a man like the unspeakable Farley simply speechless with dismay is to us the acme of pure joy. Secondly, it forces the hand of Mr. Roosevelt. He has got to decide now as to whether he means business, or is only giving us some harmless Coué stuff to make us feel every day and in every way better and better. Lastly, it shows conclusively that the nation is ready for radical reform. Five years of unbroken depression, with little hope yet in sight, are working their consequences upon the American mind. So, with all our might, Hurrah for Upton Sinclair!

Is Fascism coming in this country? The answer is easy. Fascism has already come! It has taken possession of the State of Louisiana, for example, in the well nigh unmentionable person of Senator Huey Long. This insufferable demagogue has seized Governor and Legislature, subdued them like a slave-driver to his will, and passed laws which make him as absolute a dictator in his state as Mussolini in Italy. Let there be no mistake—what has been triumphantly established in Louisiana is Fascism undisguised and unashamed. The only saving grace of the situation is the sheer ridiculousness and vulgarity of Long, which must in the end be his undoing. It is impossible that such a clown can last. But the South is not alone—it is matched by the far West! For Fascism is at large also in California, where big business has united with corrupt government to destroy labor, wipe out civil liberties, and therewith destroy democracy. In this State no outstanding public figure leads the van of oppression and tyranny. But the system is at work, and the results are as terrible as anything known in Italy or Germany. The "California Casualty List," giving the names of the victims of the terror in cities and towns of the Golden State, as published in the *Nation* for August 29th last, is a document which even Hitler might find it hard upon the instant to duplicate. The one bright spot on this western horizon is Upton Sinclair, whose recent primary election triumph is evidence that a goodly portion of California citizens have not yet donned the black shirt. Other localities where Fascism is today rearing its ugly head would not be difficult to name—including Wash-

ington. In more than one office in the capital these days is the Fascist spirit, if not in any definite sense the Fascist regime. Resentment of criticism, denunciation of opposition, "cracking down" upon those not agreed or in dissent, bureaucratic domination, these familiar features of administration may be mere defects of temperament, but they are never the less first steps toward dictatorial control. Away with them all! Even in days like these there should be no place in democratic America for those who would rule—and ruin!

The American Liberty League, recently organized by Jouett Shouse, John W. Davis, Irenee du Pont, Nathan L. Miller, Alfred E. Smith, and James W. Wadsworth, looks like a back-handed and underhanded attempt to attack President Roosevelt and defeat the New Deal. As such, we have no belief in it, and no use for it. The purposes of the League read like holy writ—

> . . . to defend and uphold the Constitution, disseminate information that will teach the necessity of respect for rights of persons and property, to teach the duty of government to encourage and protect individual and group initiative, and to foster the right to work, earn, save and acquire property, and to preserve the ownership and lawful use of property when acquired.

All this is definite enough, perhaps noble enough. But the real weave beneath the formidable fustian is a proclamation of return to the good old days before the cataclysm of 1914, as though the eggs scrambled in that debacle could ever be put together again. The liberty that these old-fashioned Democratic and Republican big-wigs believe in is a liberty of exploitation of man and nature which has brought us where we are. Art unhallowed struggled for property, acquired by any method and at any cost, has been the making of widespread poverty, inordinate wealth, corrupt politics, social degeneracy, cyclical depressions and economic crises, and the ever recurring havoc of war. Liberty of the successful and the strong has inevitably meant the subjection of the masses and thus their loss of all real liberty. As we read the names of the men conspicuous in this new League, we find few who have ever done very much in the cause of human freedom as divorced from that class freedom which means privilege and power for themselves and their kind. Not by such attacks will the Roosevelt administration be weakened. The Constitution?—Yes!—But a Constitution fitted to the conditions of an age which demands deeper and wider liberties than the fathers ever dreamed.

Mary Austin, dead last month, was in mien and manner a sybil. Mingled with her air of aloofness and dignity was a solemnity which was imposing. It was manifest that she had lived deeply, had known trial and sorrow, and from her experience had distilled wisdom and philosophic calm. The circumstances of her birth and rearing, her ill-health, her marital tragedy, her contacts with the primitive redman, her long sojourn in remote places in mountain and desert, had all combined to fashion her inner temper of mind, and to quicken a spiritual genius which was perhaps the central element of her being. We find significance in the fact that her last book, published shortly before her death, was an intimate personal confession on the subject of prayer. She believed that prayer could be answered, and in this book suggested the technic necessary for successful petition. We remember, almost with awe, an afternoon we spent with Mary Austin in New York some years ago. She was as if rapt that day—inner emotions of the spirit seemed to possess her, and she spoke of religion with a mystic passion which was strange to our reserved New England habit. We felt as though this were the way the oracles must have spoken in the ancient day, and from that hour "the Delphic sybil" has to us been real. To the American public Mary Austin was primarily an author. Her work in the field of literature had great distinction, and much of it is destined to be remembered for its interpretation of the primitive folk-lore and faith of the Indians who were the first Americans. Yet she touched Italy as well as Arizona, and knew the great New York metropolis. Her biography of Jesus, "A Small Town Man," is an unforgettable book, one of the few really important studies of the Nazarene written in our time. There was wonder in this woman—deep insight, far vision, commanding character. Death seems dignified by her communion.

The Murdered
I

We are not innocent of any stain—
We, whose stern law has sentenced him to die.
(May God forgive us, brother) you and I
Helped twist that kink of murder in his brain.
"His is the guilt," you say, and with a vain
Murmur of scorn or pity, you pass by.
But it is our guilt, too: and we deny
Our murder with the old excuse of Cain.

We were a part, too, of that grim machine
That sucks the goodness from the hearts of men—
Call it the State, the System, what you will—
This thing that kills him now and made him kill
Was our creation. Can we answer, then,
"Are we our brother's keepers?" and be clean?

Laurence Lee Howe.

The Murderer
II

Some must be crushed beneath this great machine,
Civilization. Some weak souls must fall.
Some must be foul that others may be clean;
Some must go mad to save the minds of all.
When the machine goes wrong, and some poor slave
Goes mad, we still must think our god does right:
The prison and the madhouse and the grave
Take such mistakes and hide them from our sight.

Thus are we guiltless; and these others bear
The weight of sin we otherwise would share.
We reap the benefits; they pay the cost. . . .
But Christ, who died that all men might be free,
May yet require their souls of you and me.
None can be saved if any one be lost.

Laurence Lee Howe.

The Psychology of Sex

If the reader expects to find set forth in this article some new and startling ideas he is likely to be disappointed. What the writer has done has been to gather some of the more commonly known facts pertinent to the topic, to relate them to each other and to certain familiar concepts of general psychology, and to set them down in a form which might serve as an appendix to someone's textbook on—let's say, "Practical Psychology for College Students."

Individual Attitudes Towards Sex Arise Through Conditioning

When sex is discussed, people—even supposedly sophisticated young people in a college group—show great differences of behavior. Let some student ask a question which directly or indirectly involves sex, let someone in the class make an unconscious but embarrassing "break"—and observe what happens! Some burst into a roar of hearty and delighted laughter of the type so often heard from an audience in the cheaper theaters—this in spite of the fact that nothing very funny may have been said! Others wear uncomfortable, self-conscious smiles. Others appear grave and superior. Smirks, snickerings, whisperings, aloofness, disapproval in different parts of the room may register themselves simultaneously before the eyes of the instructor. Why are there these differences? Whence these individual peculiarities of behavior?

The answer is to be found in the process of conditioning. The first acquisition of knowledge concerning sex in childhood may occur under unfortunate circumstances which arouse a response of fear or disgust. If the experience is sufficiently memorable, or if it happens to be repeated often enough, the response of fear or disgust may become the automatic result whenever any stimulus to sex is presented. A father of two daughters, both in college, was considerably concerned for one of the girls because she had no interest in men. He attributed this attitude to the fact that during her childhood a supposedly trustworthy man in the employ of the family had given her a strong emotional shock. This event produced in the child a response of aversion towards that particular man, and this attitude, through the well-known process of conditioning, unconsciously became the growing girl's response towards all male persons. Since he was a wise parent, and aware that such attitudes are not normal for college women, the father was concerned that his daughter be reconditioned. For her sister, who had had no such disturbing childhood experience, and who had a healthy interest in men, he had no anxiety.

Sex Behavior May Be Traced to a "Drive"

Sex behavior may be described in current psychological language as a "drive." The word "drive" is here used as defined in Dashiell's text—that is, as a *tissue need*. Dashiell gives a careful description of the hunger "drive" which is very easily translated into an account of the sex "drive." Certain physiological needs of the tissues and organs of the reproductive system issue orders to the central nervous system, in the fashion of a dictator to his subservient parliament, that something must be done to meet these needs. In the young and unsophisticated this something takes the form of random, restless activity. If the person who is thus driven succeeds in some bewildered and puzzled manner in satisfying his "tissue needs," the restlessness which has disturbed him gives place to a feeling of well-being. When the drive again is in ascendancy he is likely to repeat the behavior that had secured satisfaction in the previous instance, and thus the first steps have been taken towards normal maturity, perversion or excessive sublimation, as the case may be.

Many students consider this an adequate account of sex behavior. It is just a matter of physiology, they say, and that is all there is to it! The sex "drive" and the hunger "drive" are not only comparable; there is no significant difference between them. The fact that eating involves our relationship to non-living foods and that sex behavior involves our relationship to other conscious human beings is minimized, if not totally forgotten. The present writer believes that the description of sex as "drive," although valuable for many purposes, does not give an adequate picture. Other descriptions, involving other factors, must supplement this.

Sex Behavior May Be Traced to an Urge

The word "urge" is a convenient one for those who are interested in the psychology of consciousness. Sex behavior follows the occurrence of certain organic changes; it also follows certain mental events. Early in life many young people are not restlessly tossed about at random. They have a definite, conscious "urge" towards mating, accompanied by conscious, outspoken standards or ideals as to the proper time and circumstance when this "urge" may best be gratified. There is a consciousness of one's incompleteness as an individual, of one's need for a mate and perhaps for children, if one is ever to realize one's individuality to the highest degree.

Whether these mental urges are merely meaningless overtones sounding above the physical drive, or whether they have a genuine causal significance is a matter for philosophical speculation. But for practical purposes they cannot be ignored. He who regards his own sex life as solely the product of a "drive" cannot attain that satisfaction in it which would come to him who looks upon sex as an "urge," entangled with the entire content of consciousness, with his ideals and his sentiments.

Sex Behavior May Be Traced to an "Instinct"

Whether or not there are instincts is a disputed question among psychologists. But if there is such a thing as instinctive behavior, then presumably sex behavior may be called instinctive.

Among the recent tendencies to be noted among psychologists who write in terms of instinct are two. To some, instinct means an inherited complex pattern of behavior, such as is said to make possible the nest-building habits of birds. By others instinct is interpreted in terms of microscopic anatomy, as an inherited organization of neurones with a predetermined system of connections. This latter point of view seems reasonable enough; we are born with an equipment of nerve cells which renders some kinds of behavior possible and probable. One of these possible behaviors includes that complex and heterogeneous groups of activities that are lumped together under the heading of sex. In this sense sex is an "instinct." But to jump from this statement to the conclusion that sex is an instinct in the other sense—namely, that we inherit a definite pattern of sex behavior which matures quite apart from the influence of learning—is obviously illogical. Moreover, it is contrary to fact; this is clear if one recalls the

varying forms which sex behavior has taken among different peoples.

This question of instinct is not purely an academic problem. Practically it means that if one assumes his own private behavior pattern to be an inherited instinct, a kind of God-given, Nature-given, Fate-given arrangement, one is not likely to go to great effort to modify this behavior. On the other hand, he who limits the instinctive nature of sex to an inherited organization of neurones, with connections which may be modified by experience, learning, motivation, must admit the possibility of reorganizing his behavior in the direction of more intelligent activity.

Sex Behavior May Be the Result of Learning

For problems of everyday living outside the laboratory, a well-balanced psychology regards all actions as being the product of two factors: (1) native or inborn equipment, and (2) experience since birth. The experience of an individual modifies both his native equipment and his behavior responses to environmental situations. By experience we learn.

How many of the details of sex behavior are the result of learning! The initiatory rites of primitive tribes have their survival in conversations of the street gang, in the salacious story, in the drama and the movie, in the novel and the poem. The variations in the sex customs between one country and another, between one age and another, are the results of varieties of sexual experience.

In the old-fashioned art of courtship there are individual differences of skill. Some men and women seem to have learned how to win easily the response of the opposite sex. Others, with the most highly desirable qualities, are painfully awkward at it. Similarly after marriage there are the same differences of skill in the art of mating—that art which some devotees would lead us to suppose had been discovered since the close of the Victorian era, but which on the contrary is most ancient! This does not mean that unskilful suitors are necessarily unskilful husbands. It may be the excessively popular man or woman who sees no necessity for learning anything about sex. Many of the ills of the older generation, many of the divorces so common today, probably are the result of failure to learn the proper refinements of sex behavior.

So important is this matter that one writer has gone so far as to claim that, among a people who have been properly educated in the physiology and psychology of sex, husbands and wives might happily be chosen by lot. He makes mutual satisfaction in mating the only condition and the absolute guarantee of a happy marriage. This extreme statement is open to all sorts of questions and objections. It is certainly not necessary, probably not wise, to accept it. But it does serve to arouse our attention to the undisputed importance of sex compatibility, or mutuality, between husband and wife. Lacking this, happiness in marriage perhaps need not be unattainable, but would be difficult.

Sex Behavior May Be Largely a Social Product

Since so much of human behavior is learned, and learned not from electric shocks or sounding forks in a laboratory but from other people casually met upon the street or gathered into the groups which perpetuate our social institutions, it would be quite possible to minimize the part played by instinct and inheritance in sex and to make out a case for the assertion that sex behavior is largely a social product. Any incipient flirtation provides an excellent stock illustration of the fact of mutual stimulus and response which is the basis of all social psychology. The social groups to which individuals belong—family, play-group, neighborhood, state and nation, club and lodge, church and association —by their activities, their pronouncements in words, and their silences, contribute patterns of behavior with reference to sex.

This inevitable influence of social groups upon individual behavior may be unplanned and unconscious, or it may be deliberate. When it is honest and frank in avowing its purposes, it may be called sex education. When it hides its real aim, it is propaganda. Documentary evidence ought not to be required to support the general assumption that there is a good bit of sex propaganda turned loose by those who believe that they can make money by catering to over-stimulated sex appetites. Under the pretense of printing or filming what the public wants, they make use of the principle of suggestion to induce the public to want what they have to sell. How much of modern youth's attitude of victorious independence with regard to sex actually represents an ignoble succumbing to this propaganda?

As we learn to understand the part played by experience and by social influences, we shall probably come to have a saner attitude towards abnormalities in sex behavior. This does not mean that perverts who are a menace to the normal development of others ought to be permitted free range. It does mean that abnormalities will be studied and judged less upon an emotional plane and more upon a dispassionate weighing of the facts. Science has at last begun to accumulate its data, to gather its statistics, pertaining to forms of sex behavior. Eventually this information will change our attitudes.

Is Sex the Fundamental Fact in All Conduct?

Quite apart from whether sex behavior is physically or consciously aroused, whether instinctive or learned, whether individual or social, there are those who claim it as the key to an understanding of all other behaviors. This is the Freudian position, but one does not have to be a Freudian to make such an assertion. By some, hunger is linked with sex and the two are made the fundamental factors. Or hunger may be subordinated and sex satisfaction presented as the single underlying motive for man's entire gamut of activity. Sex, it is claimed, explains everything else.

It would be just as true, I believe, to claim that everything else explains sex. So far as purely physical "drives," or tissue needs, are concerned, there are eight or more (hunger, thirst, fatigue, temperature, etc.) which are at times just as selfishly insistent in their demands as sex. So far as non-visceral "drives" or "urges" are concerned there is an indefinite number which are as genuine and at times as absorbing as the desire to mate. These urges include the desire for mastery, for submission, to beget children, the "instinct of workmanship" or creative urge, gregariousness, altruism, curiosity and religion. Instead of asserting that sex explains all these, it is far more reasonable to suppose that they contribute to sex behavior.

Let us suppose a chaste individual of late adolescence who becomes so strongly attracted towards a person of the opposite sex as to forsake chastity for matrimony or its substitute. Is *sex* an adequate explanation of his conduct? By no means! It may be that he is motivated by curiosity, and wishes a "knowledge by acquaintance" rather than the "knowledge about" the subject which has hitherto satisfied him. He may be

expressing the "urge" to mastery, or the urge to submission. It may be mere loneliness, the unsatisfied urge to gregariousness, which is responsible. It may be an altruistic desire to give happiness to another. It may be some other physical "drive," such as fatigue or temperature, that leads to sex conduct which would not otherwise be indulged in. It may be the desire to win social approval, to be thought sexually competent by one's group. It is absurd to claim that all sex behavior arises out of some simple, single, primeval inherited impulse. It may arise out of these other impulses, singly, or in combination.

The Inner Battle of "Drives" and "Urges"

These fundamental "urges" and "drives" sometimes get in each other's way. The result is conflict. Strictly speaking, all psychological conflict is within the individual, not between him and society. Where society seems to be involved it is more likely to be the individual's "urge" to win social approval that is a factor. The facial expressions, the snickers and refusals to laugh, referred to in an earlier paragraph, are manifestations of such inner conflicts. Although in many conflicts the sex impulse is involved, it is not involved in all. A teacher has told me of a pupil who used to go out behind the barn when he wished to use hammer and nails, because his home life had given him the impression that it is wrong for anyone except a servant to do physical work.

Occasionally there are superstitions abroad, such that sex relations are necessary if one is to be healthy. The fact is that one may be chaste and healthy, or he may have frequent sexual relations and be healthy. Neither chastity nor sexuality is the determining factor. What does matter is how the sex life is organized with reference to one's other drives and urges. If it leaves one free from disgust, worry and self-accusation, well and good. If it does not, reorganization is needed somewhere.

Much of the sex impulse must be sublimated. Fortunately even the fickle among us do not fall in love with all persons of the opposite sex. Watch the noon-hour crowd on your main street some day, and discover how many people in the world there are who do not attract you as potential mates. That this is so may also be attributed to conditioned responses established in childhood. Towards many of those who remain as possibilities we sublimate our impulse, expressing it in friendship, religion, social service, or in the arts.

The Laws of Psychology vs. the Laws of the State

Many people seem to imagine that if society exercised no restraints upon sex behavior, that if this restraining type of law were amended or repealed, happiness would easily be possible for everybody. Undoubtedly many such laws should be repealed. But even if all statute laws were repealed and this world suddenly transformed into an anarchist's heaven, the laws of psychology would still remain. Quite apart from what the legislators may place on the books, each human relationship has its effect upon the actors. Whether within the institution of marriage or without it, for example, there is a psychological danger in early intimate relationships. They should not be entered upon casually, nor before one has reached maturity of body, mind, and judgment. One intelligent observer who has been acquainted with many a companionate marriage reports that there are just as frequent mismatches in these freer unions as among a corresponding number of legal marriages. The gospel of self-expression is a good one —if these other urges are not forgotten. They must not be repressed just to give the sex impulse a fling. It is more important that *you* be satisfied than that any one urge be satisfied.

Psychology Applied to the Choice of a Mate

Psychology should not be expected to furnish precise rules which will infallibly lead one to a suitable mate. What may reasonably be expected is that psychology, in connection with physiology, will assist in eliminating from consideration those who are unsuitable, thus narrowing the range of choice. As personality tests are developed and utilized perhaps science will gradually have more to offer.

The first to be eliminated should be those in ill health. Health is relative; few if any enjoy perfect health over a long period of years. But persons who suffer from such diseases as tuberculosis and syphilis, or who have a family history of insanity are not good matrimonial risks.

Next to health, compatibility is the most important criterion. In polite conversation compatibility may refer to such trivial matters as agreement concerning the choice of neckties. But the underlying significance of the term is undoubtedly in connection with physical attractiveness and the capacity to give mutual satisfaction in the sexual relationship.

There should be an assortment of common interests to be shared with one's mate. These will insure that leisure time and periods of recreation can be enjoyed together. Complete identity of interests is not necessary; indeed it is probably undesirable, for a portion of the leisure time may well be spent apart. But obviously there should be some common ties in addition to physical compatibility if the partnership between a man and woman is to endure.

Also of importance is what may be called compatible purposes. If the husband's chief aim in life is the making of money and the wife seeks culture and refinement, or if the husband wishes to give himself to some art or profession and the wife craves social gaiety, or if the husband aspires to the presidency of the local bank and the wife wishes to lead the communist party to victory at the polls, frequent friction will be the repeated order of the day. The ultimate purposes of both parties, their ultimate goals in living, whether these be frankly stated or only unconsciously expressed in conduct, need not be identical but they should be compatible.

Any relationship between men and women which is to be permanent sooner or later involves the families of both. It may seem that marriage is nobody's business except that of the two parties most intimately concerned. It seldom works that way. The ideal of forsaking father and mother to cleave to wife or husband is not to be taken too literally. Loyalty to parents is a desirable virtue in a mate. And loyalty may involve care in sickness and old age. Perhaps your parents-in-law will some day have to come to live with you. It is a good idea to look the family over in advance with that in mind.

Friendships Between Men and Women

Although the sex impulse is always potential in relationships between men and women, in many cases it is present, if at all, in a negligible degree. Two people may be drawn together by a love that is like that of parent and child, brother and sister, comrade and friend. To reduce all such attractions to a sexual basis

is a false simplification. Failure to understand this fact is the source of some tragedies. The two persons themselves, their families, their friends, unite in assuming that since there is an attraction it is therefore sexual and, under frequent circumstances, improper. The fact may well be that sex is a minor element in the attraction and that in a favorable social environment it might easily be sublimated to permit the growth of a valuable friendship.

Sex and Ethics

This article has attempted merely to present some of the important facts concerning the sex behavior of ordinary people. It has offered no discussion about their ethical aspects. Popular views concerning the ethics of sex are in a period of rapid transition. In the midst of this flux of opinion whoever wishes to arrive at sound ethical conclusions must take into account the facts which a study of the forms of human behavior reveals.

The writer believes that there is no definite code of sex ethics which is binding upon all persons at all times. But there is a fundamental principle which is a universal key to self-realization and happiness—treat yourself and others as persons, not as things. It is even more true in the sexual relationship than elsewhere that altruism and mutuality are the prerequisites for the greatest personal satisfaction.

The sex impulse has many ramifications. That which popularly passes for the sex impulse is more than the tissue need of the behaviorist. It is a complex weaving of many an urge and motive. Yet to begin a discussion of sex as tissue need and as inherited instinct is legitimate. Such a beginning does not in any way deny the beauty and mystery of sex. These latter aspects are reflected in drama and novel and poem and painting. Our world needs far more scientific knowledge concerning sex than it now possesses. But no matter how much this knowledge may increase, the eternal mystery and charm of the opposite sex will remain for him who approaches life with an aesthetic receptivity for the realm of beauty around and about and for the delicateness of emotion and feeling within.

ELMO A. ROBINSON.*

*Associate Professor of Theology, State Teachers College, San Jose, California.

Motion Pictures—Miracle or Menace?

Motion pictures are a miracle of science. It was discovered a few years ago that the human eye retains a visual image through a certain period of time, the eye being a little slow in its action. Building on that fact, science found that by flashing consecutive pictures before the eye fast enough to outrun the speed of vision the illusion of continuity could be produced, giving the sense of being alive. By that means dramatic art went out into realms of which it had never dreamed before. Mountain ranges, the sea, the Arctics, the Tropics—the whole world was called into service as scenery. Great actors and actresses, formerly available only to the few who could get to the places where they were acting, now became available (by way of the screen) to every crossroad hamlet. Dramatic impressions, formerly impossible, now became commonplace through the tricks of photography. The pictures take their audiences to every part of the earth. People who have been traveling have said that when they came to places for the first time it seemed as though they had been there before. They had seen the places on the "movie" screen. I, myself, have visited the South Pole through the moving pictures taken by the camera of Admiral Byrd.

This miracle of science and art has become an educational force in the nation second only, perhaps, to the school. One hundred and twenty million people attend the "movies" in America every week. In other words, all of America goes to the "movies." About one-third of this attendance consists of young people. Almost every child in America is a "movie" fan. Thereby the children are learning much. The pictures bring before their eyes a visualization of facts, places and things which lead them to a splendid understanding of the world. An investigation was recently made in the case of some children who had seen a certain motion picture. It was discovered that three months after seeing this picture, the children remembered from sixty to ninety per cent of what they had seen. There is not a school teacher who would not be happy if her pupils remembered sixty to ninety per cent of what they had been taught, three months afterward. Such is the vividness of the impressions which come from the screen.

The motion pictures are educating our children far more than the churches. Only about forty per cent of the nation's children attend our Sunday Schools, for one hour a week. The motion pictures are getting practically one hundred per cent of them, for from two to three hours every week, with a vivid means of instruction which far surpasses our resources. The public schools have them more hours in the week, but with methods of instruction which cannot compare in vividness. A recent book is entitled "Our Movie Made Children." It is a good description of our present day American childhood. Even if a child is kept away from the theatres, he hears all about the pictures on the playground, with the worst ones most vividly retold.

Much of the instruction given by motion pictures is good. There have been some great motion pictures produced: "The King of Kings," "The Covered Wagon," "The Sign of the Cross," "Cavalcade," and many others. But, alas, many pictures are being produced which are very bad and many of us are forced to believe that the moving pictures have become a menace to society. When a child goes to the "movies," he almost always sees drinking, gambling, debauchery, crime, the home made light of, loose women portrayed as beautiful and noble, the church ridiculed, and every commandment of the Decalogue broken merrily and attractively. He sees successful crimes committed, showing every detail of how they are done. He beholds horrors which unsettle his nerves.

Dr. Hibben, formerly President of Princeton University, called together a committee of investigators, about five years ago, to learn the truth as to the influence of the motion pictures on America's

childhood. The five year study of this committee is now complete and available. It was made by experts and is thorough, fair and conclusive. The researchers interviewed thousands of children and young people in homes, schools, penitentiaries, reform schools, detention homes, on the streets and on the playgrounds. They tried desperately to get at the facts. They concluded that at least ten per cent of juvenile crime (which is most of our present crime wave) was committed under the stimulus of some motion picture which gave the juvenile offenders the idea for the crime. Twenty-five per cent of the delinquent girls told how at some motion picture they saw a favorite heroine sell herself to lust and still remain noble, thereby receiving the impulse which eventually led to their own downfall. From one group of one hundred and ten crimes investigated, forty-nine per cent of the criminals said they got their ideas of carrying a gun from the "movies," and twenty-eight per cent their ideas of practicing stick-ups. One youthful criminal complained that the motion pictures tell you how to perpetrate a crime, but nothing about the suffering which results. One young murderer said that he got his idea for the crime he committed from Lew Ayer's picture, "The Door Way to Hell." Protests and warnings have come from all sources, but the producers have plunged on in the staging of such stuff—to make money at any cost to the nation!

One of the worst influences of the motion pictures is the evil tale they tell of us in foreign lands. An exhibitor in New Zealand wrote this protest, printed in a motion picture journal:

> It would be no exaggeration to say that nothing America has ever done or is likely to do has injured the standing of the United States as much as the pictures it has produced. You could not persuade even a fifteen year old boy in New Zealand that the following is not true: first, that every American from the President down to the toughest gangster is not a hard drinker; second, that there is an honest business man, politician, judge or jury; and third, that there is any such thing as a clean, honest newspaperman. That is what the American producer has done with this golden opportunity. It has gone beyond recall—the opportunity to build up throughout the civilized world the most wonderful and profitable reputation for American home, political and educational life any nation has ever had. But what has it done? It has taught the world that those things our mothers, our churches, our government taught us to believe were not worth having. It taught us to believe that clean, honest courts of justice, clean honest home life, clean honest sport are not known in the United States; that every man breaks the law against drinking, and that marriage is a farce.

From Toyko came an appeal two years ago, addressed to the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, signed by ninety American residents in Japan, asking for legislation to control the shipment of American "movies," to protect the reputation of America in the Far East.

From Turkey comes the following story, as told by a young American missionary there:

> Hollywood is continuing to send its dirtiest pictures to the near East and the theatre managers give free shows to children and encourage their attendance. The pictures shown here are of the sort that are banned in America. Several weeks ago some of my boys invited me to go with them to the first talking film to come to the City. In all innocence I went, and from first to last I was ashamed for America. Here was I, a missionary, wasting precious moments translating a lot of silly trash for foreigners who drank in every word.

The Lahore Rotary Club in India, petitioned the government of the Punjab as follows:

> It is the opinion of our members that the time has come when the government should be moved to take drastic action against the cinemas concerned (American). We would respectfully ask that the government enforce the laws of censorship and insist that the film in question be closed down immediately.

Germany has put high embargo on American-made pictures. England, France, Sweden, Russia, are all protesting against, or barring entirely, the pictures that Hollywood is sending them.

It is high time that America did something to save what is left of her reputation. America is being betrayed by her motion pictures. They are like a colony of white ants eating away at the foundations of a house while the occupants sleep.

(Rev.) Jessie H. Baird.

An Adventure in Cooperative Living

What would you think of a society or a community where food, clothing and shelter were furnished as a matter of course?

Wouldn't it wake you up to get into a group that did not have a landlord; where there were no bills at the end of the month for fuel, for water, for light, and where the doctor did not present a bill for his ministrations, and where the nurse was only concerned that she gave efficient service?

You'll probably say that here follows a resumé of Edward Bellamy's increasingly popular "Looking Backward." Nothing of the sort, for that was a chimera of his brain in the 'nineties!

There is such a place in America, and it has been in existence for nearly nineteen years, having started in the Antelope Valley, above Los Angeles, in California, but now set down on the cut-over highlands of Louisiana. The name is Newllano Cooperative Colony. Despite the fact that the nation has been going down hill lamentably since 1929, the Llano Cooperative Colony has improved, paid off debts, built important buildings and new homes, cleared scores of acres of land, increased the dairy, the poultry department, the bees—in fact, all down the line an improvement! And don't think that it has been easy, that the colony has been running into prosperity on greased skids! Not at all! It has advanced against great opposition, over obstacles physical and financial, mostly financial, and in the midst of bitterness on the part of a set of harpies that infest this as well as every other forward-looking movement that ever started.

Why has Llano gone ahead? For this reason: It produces for use and not for profit. Had it been otherwise, it would have died aborning. Were this colony run for profit, where would it be today? More than half the industries of the country have gone out of business since 1929, and millions have folded up their tents and silently disappeared since the day we were a hopeful people on the mystic far-reaches of the magnificent Antelope Valley, an arm of the Mojave desert, in California, in the year 1914.

The Colony pays no wages!! You will probably ask, "How can people live *without* wages?" If I wanted to be cruel, I'd ask you how do 14,000,000 unemployed now live without wages; how about another 14,000,000 existing on charity which is inadequate?

Here is the reason no wages are paid: Llano Colony is owned by its members—each is an equal owner, as soon as he has been here long enough to qualify as a member. Why then should a group of owners fool themselves that they were getting anywhere by taking money out of one pocket and putting it into the other?

The Colony, which is a corporation, endeavors to take care of every want of each member. By this I mean his primal needs are first catered to, such, for instance, as food, clothing and shelter. The colony exerts every ounce of its energy to make its members comfortable, feed them well, and clothe them with the best that the treasury can afford.

It must not be understood that all of our "wants" are catered to, not by any means! To attempt to supply human wants would take a treasury of inexhaustible resources. But the *needs* are carefully considered and given every attention, and it is regrettable to state that we run short of this and that and have suffered in common with the rest of the world, for be it known that no person or institution, under the existing form of society, can be independent.

Therefore, the Colony gets short of many things. Shoes, socks, overalls, dress goods, kerosene, gasoline, sugar, even salt, and a lot of other things run out, and money runs out too. When the food at the cafeteria is scarce, why, it is simply up to us to grin and bear it, tighten the belt and go along as if the stomach were really full.

There's another reason why scarcity occurs. The Colony has opened its arms to so many hundreds—offered an asylum, if you please—without cost and without price, that it has necessarily run into trouble. If you know anything at all about running a big home or an institution, you will know that it takes lots of money and food to feed six hundred people, as well as lots of clothing to keep them warm. It is this getting beyond our limit to help that has made us short on many occasions. But it has done us good. It has taught us a tremendous lesson.

We have learned what *not* to do in many instances, and this is knowledge that we are willing to share, especially with those who think of ameliorating mankind's pitiable state by starting self-help organizations, or colonies.

Llano Colony is the inheritor of an old mill town. The site of the colony was once the scene of a big lumber industry. When we took it over in 1917 there were 20,000 acres of cutover land; 259 board houses, several nice homes where the officers lived; two immense lumber sheds, a postoffice and general office, and a big store.

Many of the homes were unlivable but were renovated. Many were torn down and used to patch others. In the interim several good homes were built, quite modernly; together with a ten-ton ice plant and cold storage, a brick store, garage and machine shop, a fifty-room apartment house, a small modern sawmill, a fine planing mill, a good-sized veneer factory, and a laundry and print plant. Much of this work has been done since the depression struck the country in 1929.

You will readily get the picture that this is no modern city. Rather, you will appreciate that it is still in a pioneering stage, and for the very good reason that the matter of raising food and fabricating things with which to make life more comfortable were of more importance than being physically comfortable.

However, none of us has gone shelterless, or foodless, or without clothes, though all these have been scarce, at times. Right now, for instance, the housing is very short. The housing department is hard pressed these days to take care of the people who are coming to us. You see, the terrible conditions in America are driving to our portals people who have lost in the competitive struggle. It is not altogether an unmixed blessing that so many do come, because it runs those here short. It takes the producer *one year,* though he has paid the membership of $1,000, to put himself on a productive or self-sustaining basis after he arrives. Now suppose he has paid nothing, as is often the case! How long then is it before he is self-supporting? Quite a period of time.

The school system in the colony is supposed to be ideal. The children are in school half the day and the remaining part of the day are in the fields, gardens, orchards, factories, or playing, or what not. At any rate, half the day is devoted to book learning, or as is often said, "academic studies," and the other four hours are put into something practical.

You must not imagine that these children are cruelly treated, and made to work. None of them is being hurt by labor. It is valuable discipline and experience, and most of the parents approve the idea. It relieves them of the care of the youngsters.

For instance, the "Kid Kolony," about one and three-quarter miles from the main colony, located in a pleasant "piney" place, takes care of the children up to the fourth grade; at present the seventh grade is being taught there. The kindergarteners are brought to the Kid Kolony in a big car and are cared for all day long, given work to do, put to bed, taught and trained as youngsters should be by competent teachers.

The Llano schools are under educators with extensive experience who have for years envisioned this sort of a school system and are now most happy in seeing it in actual practice. The schools are the pet idea of Manager George T. Pickett. He has been deeply interested in the youth since his arrival in the movement, nearly nineteen years ago from Fresno, California. In the old colony, he had at one time three hundred and fifty youngsters under his direct management, and he made his "Sierra Madre colony" of youngsters a potent factor in the scholastic and social life of the colony. He carries out the same ideas here. In this connection it is interesting to mention that the founder of this movement, Job Harriman, of Los Angeles, had a very broad idea of the education of children. He felt that children did not get all that was coming to them under capitalism, and were educated from the profit point of view and not from the service concept. In this, most of us think he was right. And it is our school idea that intrigues most of us.

The man as a rule is interested in the question as to where he can fit himself into this type of an organization. As a matter of fact there is little need to worry. It is amazing to see how many mechanics the garage, the tin shop, the machine shop, the blacksmith shop, the electrical department, the plumbing department, the shoe shop, etc., etc., can absorb. Most of the men who come to us are mechanics. Gardeners and farmers are the scarce type. And what the colony really needs most are farmers and gardeners, horticulturists, growers of things. Never have we had enough of the tillers of the soil, though now that the farm mortgage is hitting the farmer so hard, more of them are deserting the old home place and lining up with us.

Food, food, is the big need. This powerful urge has been before us since the opening of the growing season. We know that the person who grows food is safe. He who depends on skill, or on things to trade, does not stand a very good chance in the battle. To note: The colony makes the finest sweet potato crates in the state. This year it has not sold one, yet the price was cut in half. There are 25,000 of these wonderful crates stored away, no market in sight. Those that used to buy with actual greed now pass them by, saying that the crates cost more than the potatoes bring.

The colony is expanding. It owns a rice ranch ninety miles south of Newllano, and this year supplied 400,000 pounds of rice. About twenty-five people are there, and live rather well from the garden, cows, chickens and ducks. They do not have to worry about the rent, or food, or taxes. All they need to worry about is to get a better living. If they do not live well, whose fault is it? They have everything to work with, tools, machinery, animals, and man power—and, no expenses! If a person cannot make a living under those conditions, does he deserve a living?

The unit idea is growing. We have a small unit at Fremont, Texas, where Ole is specializing in onions, and is starting the citrus industry. This place is especially adapted to these products. Units should always be located where certain things can be grown that cannot be grown elsewhere. This enables the different products of the different units to be happily exchanged.

At Gila, New Mexico, in the remarkably beautiful Gila valley, with first water rights, is another unit. Negotiations for this have only recently been completed, and some twenty of our first-class people are manning it, men and women. The place was built years ago to accommodate President Theodore Roosevelt, and it was there that he planned his great African hunt, while hunting from the lodge some fifty miles up the Gila river. No finer climate in the world than at Gila, at 5,200 feet; crops are marvelous, cattle, hogs, poultry, horses do wonderfully. Already this unit is a going concern.

It is to test the individual that each new applicant is requested to register at the mother Colony at Newllano. It may be helpful in this connection to know that memberships can be bought on the instalment plan. We have people who are paying at the rate of one dollar a month. Some pay more. There is a regular "Units Fund" featured in the *Llano Colonist*, a magazine which has a wide circulation, including several foreign countries.

Probably one of the most important steps the Colony has ever taken in a speculative way is now going on. It is getting ready to bore the second hole for oil on what is known as the Conroy trend, which contains many of the biggest wells in the world. The first well, finished a few weeks ago to 3,600 feet, made a satisfactory showing. While reaming for the purpose of setting the casing, five hundred feet of 4-inch drill stem were lost on the bottom and despite every effort on the part of fishers, the hole had to be abandoned. Did this discourage us? Not the Llanoites! A new location was made the next day about two miles west on some of the other likely looking ground of the 20,000 acres under control, and even as I write, the hammers and saws are busy getting the camp ready for the crews, the wood-choppers, the cooks, etc.

Should we seek oil and gas? This question has been asked by many of us. It has been said that any old fool can stand adversity; what puts him down and out is prosperity. Well, we have talked this over and agreed not to go crazy if we do get rich. Here's what will be done with the excess money: More colonies will be started! It is our idea to have colonies in every state, and many of them. It's the movement that we are interested in, not merely a little bit of a colony that can make life secure and free from worry for a few people. We are all looking to the greater thing ahead.

It seems to us that our experience should be worth something to thinking men and women, even if they do not want to come here. We have proved many things. We know what will work and what won't work. I venture to say that there is no place in America where such a laboratory exists—the human laboratory. With the profit motive removed and the individual face to face with himself and his neighbor, the true man comes forth, and he is either a true co-operator or he is not. Close association tells the story.

This is the reason why the social life of the Colony is so delightful. We have had many people come and go. It is the unusual thing to hear anyone say a harsh word about the social life; he has always been charmed with it. He may "beef" and kick about the food, the bed, the leaky roof and a lot of things of this sort, yet you ask him how he likes the social life, and there is likely to be warm approbation, for nowhere in the world is there such *camaraderie*. In this society of ours there is not a false note. We do not cultivate a person here for what we can get out of him. We associate together because we like each other, and have interests in common. That should be the true source of all companionship.

A young couple were married yesterday who met on their way to the Colony in the romantic city of Salt Lake. They married because they loved each other, and because each wanted to help the other. There was no feeling on the part of the woman of "how good a living can he give"; nor was there any ulterior motive in the heart of the man. It was love and biological selection, the thing that Shaw recommended a few years ago. What is ahead for these youngsters? Will they have to worry about house rent, or clothing, or food, or a *job*; will they have to worry about the first arrival, or the seventh? No! None of these things will ever concern them. They are as free as birds, who, it seems to us, never worry about getting a living, the *bete noir* of tens of millions, of hundreds of millions on the planet today.

Continuing the social life phase! We have our dances, two or three times a week, one of the largest dance floors between Shreveport and New Orleans, and they are largely attended. The Colony musicians furnish the best of music. On Tuesday nights the "Old Timers" have their dance; a different orchestra plays. Henry Ford would approve this bunch of fiddlers! Sunday evenings the theater offers local talent, consisting of quartets, mixed and male, solos, plays, skits. Usually on these occasions the orchestra numbers fifteen and sometimes more. There is no charge for either the dances or the theater. Every one here has a chance to dance, to act, to display any talent he has.

The Llano Cooperative Colony was started as a purely economic and social entity. We figured that economics governed everything. We were naive enough to think that chemism was about the sum total of all things physical. However, we have changed our minds.

We have reached a stage of *knowing* that there is something else animating and motivating the universe and everything in it. The spirit animates the cosmos. Back of everything there is this power in the shadow.

How to handle the religions, the cults, the isms? Ah, that's the question! What church shall we build? Answer: Build none; but make it possible for any and all to meet in any of the public buildings and worship the All-Power in any fashion they choose. As a result of this policy, we have people of many religions here. We have some who are cold materialists, atheists out and out; we have the agnostics, the followers of Unity, the Bible Students, and others. There is *never* any quarrel over religion; it is never a matter of controversy. Those who are of like opinions get together and enjoy discussions and study. And all of us, in our lives, try to practice the Golden Rule.

The Colony, therefore, remains an enterprise for solving the economic and social problem, and for pointing the way to a newer and better world.

ROBERT K. WILLIAMS.*

Newllano, Louisiana.

*Editor Llano Daily News, Newllano, La.

Anti-Jewism

To argue with Fascists—with men who have renounced the use and authority of reason—is as fruitless as administering medicine to the dead. Recently Ion Duca, Premier of Roumania, issued a decree banning all anti-Semitic agitation. A few days later a member of the Iron Guard, Roumanian Fascist organization, stepped up to the Premier as he stood on the station platform at Sinai, and killed him.

In Germany the Jews have been marked for extinction via sterilization and the headsman's axe; and in every country of the world where the socially illiterate hordes of Nationalism are riding to power, the Jew has become a marked man—the defenseless prey of mobsters masked as Christian patriots. In America, the Nordic Protestant Silver Shirt Legion, under the leadership of an unmitigated scoundrel by the name of William Dudley Pelley, has revived anti-Jewism, urging that all Jews be deported as undesirable aliens.

Anti-Jewism is a religio-racial mania born in fear and ignorance; it rejects everything that interferes with its own subtle and irrational self-conceit; it abhors democracy; it spurns liberty and laughs at social justice; it tramples on the ideal of human brotherhood and international fellowship; it is hard-hearted and deliberately cruel; it is prolific of gestures and medieval melodrama, but destitute of good works—the cancer of the human mind!

Racial prejudice is the most contemptible of all forms of bigotry: it ignores the biological fact that we are all descended from a common animal ancestry—that the various races are merely branches of one tree.

The Nordic barbarians of the German forests, with their blizzard-bleached skin and hair, sprang from Asiatic and African tribes with skins scorched black by Oriental sun. Skins and religions are many; reason is one and we are all brothers.

The Old Testament Jews were savages and persecuted in the name of God; their scribes recorded these sins. They settled at the crossroads of the world and were crushed under the heels of five world empires. They imbibed the manifold cultures of their conquerors, and after the destruction of their temple in 70 A. D., by Titus, they became the carriers of law and science, literature and liberty. In modern times the Jews have become the evangels of democracy, socialism and internationalism.

The Christians adopted the Jewish records as divine revelation, and for 1600 years have used the precepts and examples of these records with deadly effect against the authors of the Christian religion—against the blood relatives of Jesus Christ. Dearly, dearly has the Jew paid for binding his sins in pamphlets and calling them collectively the Word of God!

Looking back over the history of Christendom we see the ghastly fruits of early Jewish teachings: we see the persecutions of Theophilus, the butcheries of Cyril, Constantine and Theodosius, of Clovis, Justinian and Charlemagne, of Godfrey in Jerusalem—see the indiscriminate massacre of men, women and children, the synagogues piled seven deep with murdered Jews. We see them burned to death in their homes—we see them hounded into the ghetto and from the ghetto to the Inquisition.

We see the Jews stretched upon the rack—their bleeding bodies seared with red-hot irons; we see them covered with pitch, set on fire, and then hurled headlong from towers to the stony streets belong.

In every Christian country the Jew has been forced to buy his toleration and limited liberty with gold, driving the best bargain he could. This has made him an adept in business, a genius in the gentle art of usury. The slow-thinking, unimaginative Nordic cannot compete with him—therefore, the Jew must be destroyed!

Economic prejudice is the real basis of all racial intolerance, and especially of anti-Jewism. A little more power in the hands of the Nationalists and the world will see pogroms again, even in the United States!

RALPH WESTLAKE.

Hidden Beloved

"We must love the unlovable into lovability"
—*Teresa*

The man of pride's a prisoner caged within a well.
Quick, uncoil your rope of love:
Pull him out of hell.

He munches bitter bread, and rears a wall who hates.
Go, crash down the masonry,
If he has locked the gates.

Look, there is a kernel behind apparent husk;
A soul new-sprung to light through gathering dusk.

ETHEL COLLINS.

The Third Degree

The administration of justice in this great country of ours has been often and severely criticized on the grounds of scandalous delays and of flagrantly prejudiced judgments. It has been openly and justifiably charged that in so far as the results of the judgments delivered in many of our courts are concerned, there is practically one law for the rich and another for the poor; one for the American-born and another for the alien; one for the conservative in politics and another for the radical; one for whites and another for colored. In spite, however, of these severe albeit sporadic criticisms, there does not seem to have been any public protest prolonged and vigorous enough to bring about a change in the deplorable condition of our judicial system.

If the courts are not what they ought to be, our police stations and guard rooms are much worse. From all accounts many of these latter are torture chambers and shambles of cruelty and murder. The report of the Wickersham Commission charges that many of the police stations of this country are provided with instruments of torture.

It is remarkable how long usage can lull a whole people into callousness and indifference in the presence of a monstrous evil. For the third degree—America's unique method of securing the conviction of men charged with crime—is nothing less than a monstrous evil. It is simply a reversion to the barbarous method of forcing a confession by means of torture. Everybody knows that this disease is here, and everybody seems to have come to the conclusion that it is chronic, even incurable. Thus, M. E. Tracy, writing in the New York *World-Telegram* at the time of the cold-blooded murder of Hyman Stark in the police station at Mineola, L. I., stated that in so far as the third degree is confined to cleverness, it "is essential to the detection of crime." I object! It is not essential to the detection of crime in any country in which the police are trained in the proper methods of handling criminals and securing evidence. It is only used by policemen who are ignorant of these proper and modern methods.

In the case of Hyman Stark, which was a peculiarly brutal murder in that no third degree methods were at all necessary, we were afforded by "the best people" of Mineola a sorry and sickening exhibition of depraved opinion. Public men of standing in that community actually came out in defense of the cowardly murderers of a prisoner, and sought to justify the brutal manner of his death on the ground that he was a gangster and therefore unworthy of the protection of the law. Unintentionally their plea of justification turned out to be a severe criticism of the inefficiency of the police force of this country. These citizens of Mineola in effect asked the public and the jurors, who were later to sit on judgment on the indicted officers of the law at their trial, not to judge them too harshly. It was not their fault that they were inefficient. They had not been trained in the methods used by the police of other civilized countries. Let them therefore be excused for using the only method which they know. The police of other countries use brains; ours from necessity use rubber hose, telephone books, and hob-nailed shoes.

We have courts of law, judges, juries, prisons and public executioners; and each of these persons and places has a necessary and rightful part to play in the administration of justice. It is full time that the police of this country should be told in unmistakable manner that they are only *policemen*, and that they will no longer be permitted to usurp all authority and be all in one—arresting officer, prosecuting attorney, convicting jury, presiding judge and public executioner.

Not so long ago a Commission was appointed in England, with Lord Lee of Fareham as Chairman, to investigate the methods of London's most efficient police force. I quote from that report under three heads:

1. Any deliberate recourse to the practice of making an arrest on a minor charge to facilitate inquiries into a major crime is, on principle, to be deprecated.

2. No responsible person would suggest that the police should be unnecessarily hampered in the performance of the essential duty of bringing criminals to justice. The difficulty is to insure that in the performance of this duty no arbitrary attitude or excess of zeal on the part of the police should interfere with the proper rights or liberties of the individual citizen.

3. There should be the most stringent safeguards to insure that any statements made by persons who have been charged are really voluntary, and accurately represent what the prisoner himself wishes to say. The police should watch for signs of fatigue and offer a break at suitable intervals, and if necessary a postponement. If a prisoner wishes to make a voluntary statement he should be cautioned, offered writing materials, and left to write without being overlooked, questioned or prompted. He should be entitled, if he so desires, to have his legal adviser present.

I call the special attention of police commissioners and district attorneys to excerpt No. 3 of this report. There should be *"stringent safeguards"* to insure that the statement of the prisoner is really voluntary. If he shows sign of fatigue there must be a postponement. Before the prisoner starts to write his confession he must be cautioned that he is not bound to make any confession, but if he does it will be used in evidence against him, and he must be left alone *without being overlooked, questioned or prompted.* How vastly different is the practice in this country! The confession, if it is indeed a confession, is in many cases wrung from the prisoner by indescribable tortures. Rest and food are denied, and oft-repeated beatings are resorted to, resulting in permanent injuries, sometimes even in death. And all this is meted out to every arrested man, innocent or guilty!

The police of this country set out with the wrong idea that the prisoner is obligated to make a confession, while in fact the opposite is the truth. He is not obliged to make any confession at all, and in accordance with the law he ought not to be forced or even persuaded to give evidence against himself.

There is another and worse phase of this matter. The police beat prisoners from sheer brutality, when there is really no need for a confession. Such was the case at Mineola. The district attorney, who evidently knew his men, warned them against the use of violence, on the ground that it was not necessary, as he had a strong case against Stark.

Nevertheless they killed him! The men had been brutalized by a brutal system.

Bad as this thing is, it is not only not incurable but will readily yield to proper treatment. In the first place, our judges must do what the law requires them to do, namely, refuse to accept as evidence any confession obtained by third degree methods. This would at once remove the temptation to use these methods, because if the confession so obtained is worthless, there would be no point in seeking to secure it. In the second place, the proper officials in charge of the police in our several cities and towns should at once order the discontinuance of third degree methods, and the immediate removal from every police precinct of all instruments of torture, and hold the captain of every precinct personally responsible for the faithful observance of the order.

In order to convict thugs, we must not tolerate a police force of uniformed thugs. If the guardians of the law are flagrant and unashamed violators of the law, is it any wonder that this country is suffering at the present from an epidemic of lawlessness?

I believe it is possible to bring America in line with other civilized countries in which law is effectively enforced in strict accordance with law, and I venture to suggest that no civilized people should be satisfied with any other type of enforcement.

ETHELRED BROWN.

The Study Table

A Testimony of Prayer

This book* appeared only a few weeks before its author's death. It stands, therefore, as a kind of last will and testament of one of the most distinguished women in the history of American letters. Although a small book, it is not unworthy of this place, for it has the intimate, personal appeal of a New Testament epistle or a medieval meditation. Mrs. Austin is here speaking out of what was the discipline and to her the triumph of a lifetime of ardent spiritual experience. She believed that prayer can be and is answered—that she herself found it so in careful scientific investigation—and she would tell us why, and how.

Prayer Mrs. Austin describes as "an explicit motion of the inner self which puts you in touch with the living principle which controls the existing emergency, whether it be of sickness or the need of rain to make crops grow." It is not a mere petition flung out upon the empty air, but a methodical communion with a power "existing in all created life"—like the tuning of a receiving instrument to the radio waves! There is "Mind working within the constitution of the Universe;" this Mind is "essentially like Mind that works individually in man;" the two therefore "can meet and cooperate." The endeavor to secure such meeting and cooperation is prayer, and success in this endeavor is answer to prayer.

That such success can be achieved, not by accident but by deliberate method, Mrs. Austin was sure. She had herself witnessed this success again and again, so she testifies in these pages, in the case of the aboriginal Indians of this continent. The prayer for rain, for example, is answered "regularly . . . on the presentation of the petition." She states that she has known "singularly successful cures for illness" wrought by prayer. This same phenomenon she found not only among the Paiute Indians but also among the simple folk of Italy. Practices in this latter country stem directly from the rich growth of medieval piety when "among the saints as among the savages, prayer was not so much a thing asked as a thing done—a linking of the individual mind with supernal sources of power." So impressed was Mrs. Austin by what she saw that she systematically observed and investigated these practices of prayer, by dint of long struggle uncovered and mastered the secrets, and herself became a successful practitioner. Prayers for money, health, assistance, have all been answered for her as asked. "I have results," she reports, "that can be catalogued and identified."

All this seems a little extravagant and unreal to the rationalist. Yet one hesitates to doubt an experience so earnestly and systematically tested by a trained mind, and so reverently reported. One sentence can, perhaps, suggest a bridge between rationalist and mystic: "I always know enough," says Mrs. Austin, "not to pray for the success of any venture to the laws of which I do not mean to conform."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

*"Can Prayer Be Answered?", by Mary Austin. Published by Farrar & Rinehart. $1.50.

A Statesman Writes on Religion

Secretary Wallace has made an honorable name for himself in the Department of Agriculture at Washington. Anything that comes from his pen is bound to receive respectful attention. The present book* has four chapters. The first three are from lectures given at a theological seminary, the fourth is in substance an address given at a meeting of the Federal Council of Churches.

The book is frankly a preachment to people concerned primarily with the religio-ethical emphasis on life. In the chapters addressed to theological students Mr. Wallace takes up "The Spiritual Adventure of the Prophets," "The Spiritual Adventure of the Reformers," and "The Great Spiritual Adventure of Our Age." He characterizes the Hebrew prophets as "those lion-hearted, independent prophets who first of all historic men on this earth denounced the way in which a commercial civilization so often enables the rich to get richer at the expense of the poor." "As a matter of fact they were as vivid as Senator Norris, and at the time they made their pronouncements were as unpopular as the Senator in the Coolidge administration." "The great lesson of the prophets, it seems to me, is the intensity of their conviction that behind the material there is something supremely worthwhile which guides us in our handling of material things."

In the second chapter our author deals with the Protestant reformers: Luther, Knox, Calvin. One cannot but feel that in both these chapters the handling is decidedly that of an amateur. Interesting stuff, undoubtedly, and the spirit is excellent, with-

*Statesmanship and Religion, Henry A. Wallace. Round Table Press. $2.00.

out, however, any clear guidance for anything in today's problems. These modern problems he takes up in his third chapter. The following quotation gives the essence of the doctrine preached in the whole book.

To avoid this disaster (a repetition of that of 1932) requires in my opinion a definite change in the hearts of men. I am not discussing human ethics but the attitude toward those immaterial, intangible, unknowable forces which, by faith, we believe make for righteousness and which we customarily call God. It seems to me that the time is almost here when we can say that from the hard-headed material point of view the Sermon on the Mount is practical, provided our hearts are permeated with the doctrine of Jesus and our minds are capable of formulating social machines corresponding in their precision with our mechanical machines.

Again,

Neither Socialism nor Communism meets the realities of human nature as I sense them. Both of them have an emotional dryness, a dogmatic thinness, which repels me.

All of which comes down to this! We need a revival of religious fervor, a glorified Buchmanism that shall change men's motives, eradicate selfishness, put into practice the Golden Rule, etc. All of which is lovely, idyllic, and is being preached from hundreds of pulpits in this and other lands. But with very little result.

In Cromwell's time it used to be said that every Tom, Dick and Harry went around with a Plan of Government in his pocket. Out of those plans and many others emerged the democracy that followed the American and French Revolutions. The deep essential of democracy as compared with its predecessors is the overthrow of irresponsible power. What Secretary Wallace omits in his book is any reference to the fact that the fundamental trouble with our present system of things is the use of irresponsible power which goes automatically with ownership of property. The owning class are the rulers. They probably always have been. The king was king under the feudal system only so long as he could gather into his possession and hold the larger part of the land. The fact that he inherited from his father and others the greater part of their holdings, of course, gave him a tremendous head start over his ambitious rivals. Democracy has succeeded, in so far as it has succeeded, because it has found a way of making political power responsible to those over whom the power is wielded. The ownership of wealth, especially when concentrated into few hands, as said, constitutes an irresponsible despotism, just as Senator Borah is preaching to us today. The problem confronting Secretary Wallace and his fine group of colleagues in the administration is not that of converting individual owners of property to be kind and considerate to their employes, and just in their dealings with competitors and customers. It is rather, I make bold to say, a redistribution of power, making it the servant and not the master of all parts of the social order. And by responsible, again, is meant the kind of responsibility which inheres in the term "responsible ministry in the British government," in distinction from the irresponsibility which went before it in the reign of George III and other earlier kings. Such responsibility involves the whole matter of inherited wealth, ownership of natural resources, long term investments, the determination of owners to be the despots (often benevolent, it is true) over their workers.

All this goes much deeper into the foundations of our present order than Mr. Wallace's preachments seem to go. The Law goes before the Gospel. Good Will dies in the presence of injustice. It is futile to preach "loyalty to the organization" to workers who are convinced that they are being unfairly treated. It is equally futile to preach a sense of responsibility to owners who are convinced that ownership of great industrial machines and natural resources gives them certain inalienable rights of management with which neither government on the one hand, nor workers on the other, have any right to interfere. Historically, it is hard to find instances where such powers of ownership have been surrendered other than by compulsion, either by the violent or by the better, "more excellent" way of legislation. And to those who, like Mr. Wallace, are hoping for some revival of religious fervor which will change men's "hearts" and will make them "Christian," may be commended the scorching parable of the "wicked husbandman" and its closing words from the mouth of the first Christian, "He will miserably destroy those wicked men, and will let out his vineyard to other men who shall render him the fruits in their season." And to the horrified expression of the disciples, "God forbid!" we all would respond with a fervent, "Amen."

James A. Farley.

American Milton

It is unfortunate that the rustic sentimentalities of Whittier's later poems have over-shadowed his earlier and more significant writings; he should be remembered as a radical and militant agitator for the freedom of the oppressed. His powerful, fiery denunciations of the slave-holders in the cause of Abolition reflect the real man; and they are still pertinent today, where the masses are bound and exploited by the few. But after the bloody years of the Rebellion climaxed the Anti-Slavery issue, the clarion calling of the brazen trumpet died away, and today we recall only the echoes of his oaten piping. The poems of Burns and Scott applied the torch to his creative fire; he has been likened to both by later critics and by popular opinion, but, Mordell* says, if we consider his significant work, he should be known as the American Milton. There is surely a similarity between his uncompromising effort to free the slaves and Milton's heroic defense of the Puritans.

Nor did he confine himself to writing stirring verses. He spoke before countless assemblies, was delegate to many conventions throughout the length and breadth of the North Atlantic states, and he edited successively three Anti-Slavery papers. For his pains, he was mobbed, stoned, and had one printing establishment burned about his head; but his militant Quaker spirit remained triumphant. No more fitting tribute to his influence is found anywhere than that made by Lincoln who confessed that Whittier's "Ein Feste Burg ist unser Gott" was more responsible than anything else for his signing the Emancipation Proclamation.

It was Garrison who discovered him—a rhyming yokel—and started him along the Anti-Slavery path, securing for him his first position as editor

*"Quaker Militant: John Greenleaf Whittier"—by Albert Mordell; Boston; Houghton Mifflin.

of an Anti-Slavery paper, but he was too radical for his preceptor and they soon went their separate ways, Whittier gathering about him the vanguard of the movement. He proved himself, on occasion, to be an apt politician, time after time having elected his chosen candidate to the Massachusetts legislature. Decadence came only after Slavery was no longer an issue (the problem of the freed slave, or the Reconstruction did not attract him), and he turned to the rhyming of the morbid—but pure—New England legends or to sentimentalizing over the joys of rural life.

Popular legend also pictures him as a sexless celibate, but legend errs. Physically he was handsome, and the popularity of his verses and his prominence in the cause of Anti-Slavery brought many female "pilgrims" to his feet. At least a hundred women were fascinated by this moody Quaker—many of whom would gladly have become his wife; but a timidity born of his unfortunate affair with Mary Emerson Smith and his obvious "mother fixation" stood between him and a happy, wedded life. Too, he was a Quaker, and he refused to "marry out of meeting." Celia Thaxter—Lucy Larcom—Gail Hamilton (Gail Hamilton, who built a house she hoped he could become the master of, and, from good authority Mordell has it, who proposed to him!)—Elizabeth Lloyd—Lucy Hopper—Cornelia Russ; these, with many more, he ensnared.

Mordell has had access to much new material, and he quotes in part or wholly many of Whittier's unknown, unpublished poems. His biography is a splendid and successful effort to show Whittier in a proper perspective.

LYLE H. CORS.

Napoleon on Horseback*

Almost innumerable are the dramatists who have tried their hand at Napoleon: Ludwig visualized him inwardly; Belloc mysticized him; Faure philosophied him;—but Mr. Macdonnel is the first to present him from the viewpoint of his marshals: and the result is an inevitable epic drama, plus a full accompaniment of Napoleonic pageantry, wherein, for the nth time, we follow the fantastic fortunes of Bonaparte, as well as those of the daring adventurers that galloped in his wake.

Here they come, then, the gallant twenty-six: Augereau; Bernadotte; Soult; Murat; Berthier; Kellermann; Lannes; Ney; Davout; Desaix; Marmont: Mortier; Macdonald, and their fellows—doctors; lawyers; merchants; landowners; farmers; princes; engineers:—hirelings, doctrinaires, patriots, cut-throats, plunderers, swashbucklers, thieves—as motley a host as ever followed a great conqueror to victory. From Lodi to Arcola and Rivoli, from Campo Formio to Egypt and Acre, from Vendemaire to Marengo and the Consulate, this stupendous flashing story surges Dumaslike on its way; bright with bayonets and big with guns, it thunders through Austerlitz, Jena, and Friedland, to a temporary subsidence in Spain and Torres Vedras, only to rise again to an almost unbelievable crescendo at Wagram and then crash to its catastrophic conclusion after Borodino, Dresden, and the Abdication. Follows a devastating Hundred Days, while dolorous dirges echo a slow dismal martyrdom for the supreme Warlord, as well as the downfall of his entourage (who had, one and all, betrayed this Christ of war at his Calvary); and then an afterlude sings sorrowfully the requiem of all those valiant swords as, life's fitful warfare at an end, they sleep the proverbial Byronic slumber. From first to last, we have seen them hollow; and know them in all their patchwork spirits almost as we know our nearest friends.

Not that this perspective in any wise dims our picture of Napoleon—far from it. His infinite resourcefulness; his unflagging, demoniacal energy; his hectic humors; his supernal Star—these, leading this martial cavalcade, dominate the production and unify it. For background, of course, there is the Revolution, the Consulate, and the Empire; a trilogic setting which illuminates every phase of the action, and animates it as well; while a supporting cast of opponents includes Würmser, Suvarov, Bennigsen, Archduke Charles, Kutusov, Blucher, Wellington. All in all, considering the quantity of these spectacles which have preceded it, Mr. Macdonnel's—rich in humor, color, pageantry—will at least bear comparison, presenting us, as it does, with a novel spectrum indeed, in which for the first time we see our greatest modern conqueror on horseback through the eyes of the men who rode at his side.

ROBERT C. SCHALLER.

*Napoleon and His Marshals. By A. G. Macdonnel, Macmillan, 1934. $2.50.

A Notable Pamphlet

Rare, indeed, is the twenty-five cent pamphlet which merits a full-page book-review, but Fred Henderson's "The Case for Socialism" (4th Am. ed., 1934, 146 pp. Published by the Socialist Party of America) certainly deserves at least a note, notwithstanding the fact that it contains nothing of extreme novelty.

"The Case for Socialism" is another earnest essay in presenting the Socialist cause, written for those literate and educated people who have the necessary background enabling them to understand the issues presented.

The "Case" begins with a lucid "A B C of Socialism," (c. 1) in which the very basic element of capitalism, namely private ownership of the means of production of goods, is painstakingly explained. Understanding this first chapter is like acquiring a lantern for the intellect; succeeding problems become clearer to the eye. The author handles in the eight following chapters the stock objections to Socialism, and so convincingly does he turn the objections against the objectors, that, to the reviewer, anyone who resists Socialism after this rational argument, must stand barren of reply, with only his ignorance or his base prejudices exposed. *Confiscation* (c. 2) is what the capitalist practices in levying tribute on the wages of productive labor, not what Socialism would effect! Socialists would bring into being much more *private property* than is now extant under capitalism, because more people would enjoy the things of life; capitalists think of that term only as meaning their tribute-levying right in the ownership of productive equipment (c. 3). Socialism will provide *Liberty* (c. 4) on that larger and more magnificent periphery of Walt Whitman's circle. "Progress consists in men ceasing to have to struggle for their old objects, and so being set free to work for new ideals; achieving security in lower things, and going on to higher things. . . ." (p. 59). As to *Officialism* (c. 5) in a Socialist so-

ciety, imagine what a huge railroad system would be like with only a lot of trains running around, and no dreaded "officials" to coordinate them, and bring them around when we want them. The capitalist insistence on long hours of work in a society blessed with scientific labor-saving devices is unspeakable. (c. 6.) That all the *waste* (c. 7) of advertising, the disgusting luxury of the rich, and of war, are necessary to the stability (and what stability!) of capitalism is even more damning. The final argument to which anti-Socialists usually back down, that of "against human nature," and of "survival of the fittest," generally strips the proponent morally bare and shows his own little brand of greed and ignorance. (c. 8.) The *Practicality* (c. 9) of Socialism is a matter of treating only the pimples on the patient, or going to the root of the malady,—which doctor, from the enlightened viewpoint, is the more practical?

The book is written up, not down, for an intelligent public. It is not a scolding, nor does it contain the vituperative thrusts of the literature of the sectarian aspect of the Socialist movement. As a matter of fact, Mr. Henderson does not attempt an answer to what some of us consider the more difficult aspect of the problem, namely, the method of bringing about the Socialist society.

If a substantial majority of the influential population of each country were to read Mr. Henderson's book, close it, say to themselves, "Your case is won, Mr. Henderson," and take the inevitable steps following such statement, the answer to the problem would be obvious. Yet nothing like that number of people will read "The Case for Socialism,"—some because of poverty, illiteracy, or lack of understanding; but far more ominous, those literate and educated people, for whom the book *is* written, enough of them probably to effect the change above referred to,—why will they not submit themselves to Mr. Henderson's honest argument?

The answers which come to the mind of this pessimistic reviewer are not a compliment to the "educated" people of this age. Perhaps the development of this idea may serve as a companion volume to Mr. Henderson's book.

EDWARD OHRENSTEIN.

Correspondence

Socialists of the World, Unite!

Editor of UNITY:

A pity it is that the Socialists cannot maintain a united front. Never before was there a time more favorable for building up the party. Within three years large church conferences have made Socialistic pronouncements which might have been framed by Norman Thomas. Prominent educators and publicists have veered toward the Socialist camp.

But growth is being hindered by wrangling among the leaders over proposals for action in hypothetical situations. Not but that these possible future problems are well worth discussion in the party press; but by its nature the Party platform, except in emergencies, should be confined to a consensus of party opinion on questions that have been well thrashed out and at the same time are related to the chief aims of the Party. Unless a plank meets both these requirements, it would better be held in abeyance in a small party.

Many of us felt that the 1932 Convention went out of its way to insert a Repeal plank, thus affronting tens of thousands of church people who had a growing interest in Socialist ideas. This plank had no vital relation to Socialism, and it is doubtful if a majority of the party membership favored it. It was a question which, though very important, could best be settled outside party lines.

There seems no dearth of issues on which Socialists are generally agreed. Here is a trial list: Old-age pensions, unemployment insurance, abolition of sweatshops and child labor, reduction of work hours (especially in unhealthful industries), carefully planned public works suitable for slack times, government operation of monopolistic industries, government control of credit and the enlargement of the postal savings system, the increased use of income and estate taxes as sources of revenue, requirement of a national referendum for a declaration of war, and the placing of armament manufacture solely in the hands of the government. These seem of such immediate and vital importance that even the smaller part of them might well serve as a party platform.

F. S. KINDER.

A Correction

Editor of UNITY:

I have noted your editorial article of August 20th, in which you say:

"It is interesting to read that American financiers are, or have been, in Berlin, to devise ways of extending credit to German industries. Among the financiers thus engaged are James H. Perkins, of the National City Bank of New York, and Thomas W. Lamont, of J. P. Morgan & Company."

For your information, Mr. Lamont has not been in Berlin since 1908. Any report to the effect that he has been in Berlin or in Germany this year is wholly without foundation. Mr. Lamont is engaged in no negotiations as to new German loans. Further, the only German loans in which the Morgan firm have had an interest are the so-called Dawes loan (American issue $110,000,000) and the so-called Young loan (American issue $98,250,000), both these loans being issued under the sanction of international treaties executed by the chief powers of Europe.

I do not ask for any public correction in behalf of Mr. Lamont, but he has asked me to call your attention, for the sake of accuracy, to these incorrect statements.

EDWARD SANDERS,
Secretary to Mr. T. W. Lamont.

New York City

[UNITY was misled in this matter by an editorial paragraph in the *Nation* of August 1st, page 115, which began: "Frederick T. Birchall's dispatch to the New York *Times* of July 22nd, telling of the efforts of several well-meaning American bankers to solve the immediate fiscal problem of the Reich is little short of fantastic. These bankers include James H. Perkins, of the National City Bank, Thomas W. Lamont, of J. P. Morgan and Company," etc. We were deceived into placing Mr. Lamont in Berlin by reason of the reference to Mr. Birchall, European and frequently Berlin correspondent of the *Times*. We regret this error.—EDITOR.]

A Reply to Dr. Whitaker

Editor of UNITY:

As one who has read your magazine for many years, as one who believes in many things that this magazine stands for, yet also as one who may perhaps take exception to some of the articles that are printed, I am therefore expressing myself.

I read your article by Robert Whitaker. His article, "San Francisco Tells the World," is not all correct I can assure you. It is written by one who has gleaned his information from the inside not from actual experience, or from the experiences of others, with whom I have been in touch.

I have lived in California all my life. I know San Francisco. I know Oakland. I know the valley. While the "baddish-goodish" and "goodish-baddish" may hold true in human affairs, such as San Francisco, even though expounded by Wells, I do believe that Dr. Whitaker is somewhat misinformed as to the actual happenings in this particular strike. I do not believe that this magazine would editorially protect and defend altogether what happened in this recent strike.

I know of many instances of treatment at the hands of strikers of men with whom I am acquainted that were just as serious as "bloody Thursday" referred to in this article. Fellows who were in no way affecting the strikers, who were in no way strike breakers, and yet who were subjected to treatment that would make "bloody Thursday" appear tame in comparison. Many times death is preferred to physical disfigurement or physical injury, such as many experienced at this time.

There is much that could be written in defense of what went on. Many of these halls that were raided disclosed literature of a character that UNITY certainly would not defend. At least, I hope not, for I have always understood that Communism and Socialism were as far apart as the poles. I may have a misunderstanding of the defining line between the two.

Of course, in experiences like this the public at large are the ones to suffer. Not altogether so, no, but still they suffer. But it is utterly impossible for one form of labor to dictate what shall be done to a community at large and hope to get away with it. It just can't be done. The main reason why it can't be done is because it is not the right way to do.

As to the rights and wrongs of this strike I am not sufficiently conversant to express an opinion, but there is no doubt that the longshoremen were glutted with outside labor brought in to prolong this strike. Perhaps rightfully. Again I do not argue. But when Bridges considered himself high enough in the saddle to dictate what must be done by the state at large he sunk himself right there. Again that can't be done. The why of it is because the American people just won't stand for it. We just are made or born different—we just have not the bone and tissue that tend toward such. Labor, wrong or right, must move along different lines of action if they wish to accomplish their ends. The moment they move to force by shutting down on the general public they are licked right there, for the general public won't stand for it. We Americans enjoy a fight too much for that. Their strength lies in action different from that. And that to me is just where labor falls down. It does not seem to learn. Certainly if they are right they should learn. Right is led by right. As I see it the method is wrong. Labor has been contending for years for certain things, but contending in the wrong manner. If their contention is right the very fact that it is right would in itself have shown itself as such had it not been contended for in the wrong manner. The mistake lies in the method of the contention, or contending. They have the wrong approach. The guiding brains are misguided and again and again they fall foul of the general public and are licked. Yet one can't say that the general public is just perverse, will not recognize the rights of labor. That is not true. The proletariat is not that way. No, it is all in the matter of action. Force will never accomplish what labor wants. Until labor sees that labor will continue to take their licking.

C. WOODBURY.

Oakland, California.

Praise for Unity

EDITOR OF UNITY:

I cannot refrain from complimenting your devoted periodical for the good of humanity, for an exceptionally excellent article in your series entitled "Proposed Roads to a Better Social Order."

This is a scathing and well merited rebuke of our selfish and heartless capitalism existing and persisting in this country for more than a century.

Oppressive monopoly in land ownership in large cities has been going on at an increasing rate for selfish personal wealth at the expense of the labor and slavish work of all the rest of us. Monopolizing by the utilities, and by the other accumulated centrals of wealth, is certainly bad enough—exploiting all those who have to use the necessary utilities, but land monopolies are many, many times worse.

This article—if I may suggest—ought to be given an editorial in some future issue.

"UNITY" stands for justice—the rights of the masses to a reasonable living without the necessity of the dole; and against the tyranny of the enslaving money barons who are as ruthless as the barons of feudalism, only because they have the law in their hands.

Your periodical has the courage of its convictions and its able writers ought to be praised for their outcry for the liberty of the masses.

The Lord's blessing on you.

L. E. BLOCHMAN.

Berkeley, California.

An Appreciation

Editor of UNITY:

Please send me two copies of UNITY—April 30 issue. This number contains the article by Jesse H. Holmes, entitled "We and Our World." To me it is most significant and inspiring—a perfect creation like a poem or a piece of music. I wish that it might be reprinted as a pamphlet!

ROSE BASSETT ASCHERMANN.

Seattle, Wash.

The Field

(Continued from page 22)

re-introduction of the hostage system, etc.! All these are so many proofs that our present-day sense of justice has gone back to the Middle Ages.

Many believe that the persecution of the Jews in Germany has ceased. They are mistaken! It has not yet reached its culmination. In a weekly newspaper *Stürmer,* issued by a man named Streicher, the Nazis go so far as to revive the old superstition of "ritual murder." Thus, on

the 1st of May, a special number of *Stürmer* came out with the vile accusation against the Jews that they murder Christian children in order to drink Christian blood! This monstrous lie has in the past wherever anti-Semitism has thrived, been the signal for pogroms. In civilized countries, it has always aroused the greatest loathing and resentment. This paper is now being printed with the approval of the Government in our neighboring country, Germany. The fact that *Stürmer* was recently prohibited in Berlin can only be explained by the Government's unwillingness that too many foreigners should get hold of it.

Collective punishment is used against Jews, Socialists, Communists, against all who are in opposition to the local autocratic government, not in Germany alone, but in all colonies and in all countries where a government represses the population by force. It means that innocent people are punished for something they have not done.

The hostage system transports one back to the days when a city was defended by walls with embrasures and gates that were shut at nightfall. This system has been introduced in the same places as collective punishment.

A hostage is a person who "with life and limb goes bail for the discharge of a duty." In wartime, when force is openly put in place of law, this hostage system is found in our day. For example, during the War of 1870-71, the Germans took notable French citizens and forced them to accompany the troop trains, to prevent sabotage. Also, during the Great War, the Germans took hostages to protect the troops against attack by the population or to insure the payment of war-contributions. If a soldier was killed by a civilian sniper, then a couple of the people of that country were put against a wall and shot. All these war cases, however, come under the qualification of international law, and were thus perfectly legal.

But now we have hostages seized for reprisals or penalties in peace times! There are plenty of examples:

In Italy, Mussolini still refuses to give passports to Matteotti's wife and children. They are held in Italy as hostages for penalty. They live in complete isolation. The house they occupy is under constant watch. All who visit there are placed on "the black list." The name Matteotti grates on Mussolini's ears, so the schools exacted that the children should change their name. The mother took them away from school. Now she has had to send the eldest boy to school again for the sake of his studies and he has taken her maiden name. Another deputy, Amendola, fled to Paris after twice being badly hurt by the Fascists. He died six months later, without seeing his wife, who was detained in Italy as hostage for surety and reprisal.

In Germany, the same thing is true. Listen to Göbbels' speech in Hamburg on the 18th of June, 1933, about the Social-Democratic leaders who migrated to Prague: "If they begin to attack us from Prague, then we will stick to those that remain here in Germany. Declarations are of no value to us. But we know what we have and we shall keep what we have."

Among those whom Hitler has detained in Germany are the wife and child of the Social-Democrat, Gerhardt Segar. They are hostages both as penalty for Segar's flight and as reprisal for his book about his imprisonment. Mrs. Segar and her little child are both in a concentration camp. One does not need to read Segar's book in order to know that each of the 60,000 prisoners in German concentration camps are helpless victims of the arbitrariness of Nazi jailers. Now Segar is trying to get a divorce from his wife in the hope that she will thus become valueless as a hostage. At present, the condition of their release is that Segar deliver himself up to the Nazis.

On the 24th of August last, the working-class district in Augsburg was searched by the police. It was substantiated that anti-Nazi propaganda was being continued among the Communists. The punishment was the suppression of a petition in favor of an imprisoned Communist from Augsburg and the placing of the Communists in the Dachau concentration camp on half rations for a fortnight.

In India, the father is made responsible for what his grown-up son does and is arrested as hostage for surety. When a political murder is committed, a fine is levied upon the whole district as punishment, and the sums which the poor countryside must contribute are not small. In the town of Chittagong, in Bengal, 78,631 roubles and in the Monghyr district 101,388 roubles, were paid as one year's police fine.

In all these places, present-day notions of justice are abrogated. In civilized communities the basis of punishment is that he who has broken the law shall receive the penalty therefor, and the basis of all legal protection is that he who has done no wrong shall suffer no indignity.

ELLEN HÓRUP.
Geneva, Switzerland

When Governments Promote "Peace"

That the Department of Education in the Canadian province of Ontario was circulating 5,000 copies of Beverley Nichols' anti-war book throughout the public schools, was reported in our issue of last October 15th. We are obliged, reluctantly, to inform our readers that any gratification they may have felt over this interest in the promotion of peace was, to say the least, partially unwarranted. We now learn that the book has been grossly deleted; that missing are the sections attacking the arms rings, pointing out the economic roots of war, and demanding war resistance. This may have its lessons for those who, perhaps unrealistically, have been proposing that the cause of peace be served by the establishment of a Department of Peace in our Cabinet. A Peace Department will be of use only under a peace government.

—*World Events.*

WE BUY POETRY

Beginning with its August issue WRITER'S REVIEW will publish a monthly page of verse for which we pay from 10 cents a line to twenty cents a line promptly on acceptance. We report on verse sent us within two weeks or less after receipt. We cannot return verse unless a stamped addressed envelope is enclosed.

WRITER'S REVIEW is interested in seeing quality verse on any subject, either rhymed or free verse, of from 4 to 16 lines. We will publish about 20 such verses each month. Please send us your best work.

Neil Drake, Poetry Editor.

WRITER'S REVIEW

647 Forest Ave., Cincinnati, Ohio